



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,609	09/29/2003	Michelangelo Bergia	Q77785	8509

23373 7590 01/14/2005
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

RESTIFO, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,609

Applicant(s)

BERGIA, MICHELANGELO

Examiner

Jeffrey J. Restifo

Art Unit

3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/19/04 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6 recites two separate corresponding complementary ends, however the applicant cannot rely on the reference numbers to differentiate between the two. The examiner suggests using terms like "first" and "second" in order to differentiate. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "18" is not in the figures. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

Art Unit: 3618

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauto (US 5,427,394 A).

With respect to claims 1, 2, and 8, Lauto discloses a cart 10 comprising a support structure including an upwardly projecting rear support 62,66 and a base 15 with four swivel wheels 22a-d, a thrust part (or handle) 65 and/or 69, and an upright intermediate element 63,67 able to support a basket 14, wherein said upright members have as shown in figures 1-5.

With respect to claim 3, Lauto discloses latching means 70 for securing the baskets, as shown in figures 2 and 4.

With respect to claim 4, the basket was not positively recited and therefore is considered an intended purpose and has been given little patentable weight.

With respect to claim 10, Lauto discloses the cart as being made of a molded plastic, as recited in column 3, lines 15-17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauto, as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Nasgowitz (US 4,632,412 A).

Lauto does not disclose upset-preventing appendages. Nasgowitz does disclose a cart 10 comprising an upset-preventing (or anti-tipping) appendages 34, as shown in figure 5. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the cart of Lauto with the anti-tipping appendages of Nasgowitz in order to prevent tipping of the cart.

8. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauto, as applied to claim 1 above.

Lauto does disclose complementary ends with concave receiving seats for connecting the thrust part and base or intermediate element. Lauto does not disclose the upright member having the concave seat. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have interchanged the concave seat and threaded seat as a matter of design choice without altering the function of the cart.

Art Unit: 3618

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Berlin, Propst et al., Lehrman, McArthur, Sun, Fenton et al., Mayer, Murphy et al., Wilson, Kasravi et al., Harlan, Tiramani et al., Clegg, and Anderson all disclose carts of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Restifo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:00-6:00), alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher P. Ellis can be reached on (703) 305-0168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JJR

Jeffrey J. Restifo
Examiner
Art Unit 3618